

STATE BUILDING CODE COUNCIL

906 Columbia Street SW • P.O. Box 42525 • Olympia, Washington 98504-2525
(360) 725-2966 • fax (360) 586-9383 • e-mail sbcc@cted.wa.gov • www.sbcc.wa.gov

MINUTES

STATE BUILDING CODE COUNCIL

Date: June 10, 2005

Location: Spokane Downtown Public Library

Council Members Present: John Neff, Chair; Peter DeVries, Vice Chair; Dave Baker; Rory Calhoun; John Cochran; Neva Corkrum; Stephen George; Tom Kinsman; Steve Mullet; Steve Nuttall; Terry Poe; Dale Wentworth

Council Members Absent: Kristyn Clayton, Mari Hamasaki

Visitors Present: Greg Abel, Brian Minnich, Diane Hansen, Tony Darmanin, Alice Darmanin, Zack Darmanin, Dan Skindzier, Joe Wizner, Steve Barber, Jerry Farley, Michael Trabue, Mike DeVleming

Staff Present: Tim Nogler, Krista Braaksma

CALL TO ORDER

John Neff, Council Chair, called the meeting to order at 10:30 a.m. John welcomed everyone to Spokane. Introductions were made.

REVIEW AND APPROVE AGENDA

The agenda was reviewed and approved as written.

REVIEW AND APPROVE MINUTES

The minutes of the April 8 Council meeting were reviewed. Steve Nuttall suggested striking the following inaccurate sentence on page 3, "The occupant load is calculated at 10 square feet per occupant." With that modification, the minutes were adopted.

PUBLIC COMMENT ON ITEMS NOT COVERED BY THE AGENDA

None received.

COMMITTEE REPORTS

Executive Committee

John Neff said the Executive Committee met on May 31 in Tukwila to discuss WAC 51-04 and the Memorandum of Understanding between the Council and the Department of Community, Trade and Economic Development. The Executive Committee is composed of John Neff, Peter DeVries, John Cochran, Dave Baker and Steve Mullet.

John Neff walked Council members through proposed changes to WAC 51-04. One change correlates the effective date of statewide amendments with the final adoption of model codes, except for emergency amendments. He said during the past few years the Council has deviated from the predictable three-year code change cycle. For regulators like him, adopting codes every year rather than every three years is very difficult. Thus the Executive Committee proposes returning to the three-year cycle.

Another change, on page 3 of the revised WAC 51-04, addresses the justification of local amendments. The proposal requires that local amendments be accompanied by findings of fact that refer to the five uniqueness criteria. Another amendment deals with administrative provisions not subject to Council review. These aren't located in Chapter 1 of the International codes, as they were in the Uniform codes. Thus they're simply exempted, provided they don't affect construction requirements.

John Neff said the Council must enter rulemaking if it desires to adopt the changes proposed by the Executive Committee. Then the revised WAC 51-04 will receive public testimony in October.

Motion #1:

Dave Baker moved revision of WAC 51-04 as proposed by the Executive Committee. Steve Nuttall seconded the motion.

Steve Nuttall said the only concern he has is about waiting after submitting amendments to the model code organizations. John Neff said that issue received lots of debate by Executive Committee members. He clarified that the revised WAC states that amendments shall be submitted to the model code organizations. It doesn't say that the Council will wait to act until after the model code organizations have acted.

The question was called for. Motion #1 was unanimously adopted.

Tim Nogler noted that minutes of the May 31 Executive Committee meeting require Committee action.

Motion #2:

Peter DeVries moved approval of the May 31 Executive Committee minutes. Steve Mullet seconded the motion. The motion was unanimously adopted.

Building, Fire and Plumbing Codes Committee

Dave Baker, Vice Chair, said the Committee reviewed the recommendations of the Building Code TAG regarding 2005 code change amendments. The TAG report is on the back side of the April 28 TAG meeting minutes. Of six proposed amendments, the TAG recommends passage of four as amended. Two proposals include minority reports, from Lee Kranz and Jerry Barbera on #05-001, and from Karen Braitmayer on #05-003.

Wired Glass

Greg Abel, Advocates for Safe Glass, spoke in favor of proposed statewide amendment #05-006. He said that he became interested in the safety of glass when his son broke through a wired glass vision panel at the University of Oregon at Eugene. His son was severely injured, with severed nerves, artery and tendons. Mr. Abel was the proponent of the International Code Council (ICC) code change that requires glazing products in new construction at hazardous locations to meet Consumer Product Safety Commission (CPSC) standards.

Mr. Abel said no statistical data has been available on injuries caused by wired glass because all architectural glazing injuries are lumped together. Wired glass injuries aren't specified and differentiated from other architectural glazing injuries.

Advocates for Safe Glass have enlisted the help of Dr. Philip Graitcer, a former founder of the Center for Disease Control and Injury Control in Atlanta, Georgia. He currently is a professor of public health at Rawlings School of Public Health in Atlanta. Dr. Graitcer studied the doctors' reports and the injury reports of 2,500 injuries occurring in elementary education, K-12, from glazing accidents reported by CPSC. Of the 2,500 injuries, Dr. Graitcer estimated that 90 percent were attributable to wired glass.

The exemption that was given wired glass in 1977 was only supposed to last 2.5 years, with the understanding that wired glass manufacturers would develop a safer product within that time. However instead of coming forward with a safer product, wired glass manufacturers filed a lawsuit against the CPSC. Thus what was intended as a temporary exemption has been in place for 30 years.

The wired glass exemption for elementary K-12 gymnasiums and athletic facilities was removed in 2003. After ICC passed that code change, code officials said to Mr. Abel: “Greg, if we have been able to identify that wired glass poses an unreasonable risk in these areas, how do we justify it in a public library or in a college dormitory, or any other building?” Mr. Abel said the answer is that it can’t be justified in any building. That is why #05-006 was written to include all other occupancies.

Following ICC’s 2003 passage, another wired glass manufacturer placed a precautionary statement on all wired glass sold in the U.S.: “CAUTION. Wired glass is not a safety glazing material. Its primary feature is its fire resistance. Wired glass should not be used where safety glazing is required or where human impact is possible (doors and other hazardous locations in educational facilities).” Mr. Abel cautioned against ignoring such precautionary statements by wired glass manufacturers.

In the audience today is the grandfather of a Bellingham boy who was severely injured by wired glass in an educational facility. Less than two weeks after that incident, another student was severely injured in a high school gym class and almost bled to death.

John Cochran asked if Mr. Abel has data about how much wired glass is used in new construction. He answered that annually there is about eight million square feet of wired glass sold in the U.S. He said wired glass manufacturers, controlling 85 percent of the market share for fire-rated glazing, have relentlessly prevented ICC from gaining the two-thirds majority it needs for a code change. ICC’s concern has been that a code change may result in a lawsuit for the restriction of trade or unfair trade practices.

As a result of the removal of the exemption for wired glass from K-12 gymnasiums and athletic facilities, wired glass manufacturers have been forced to introduce a new super affordable, fire-rated wired glass product that complies with the federal safety glazing standards that they were asked to develop over 30 years ago. Code officials and architects need to become educated about the availability and affordability of these products.

Steve Mullet asked if the new product is allowed under the International Building Code (IBC). Mr. Abel responded that it is. He said the exemption for wired glass can only be in a fire-rated assembly. Any other use is a federal violation.

Dave asked if the language of #05-006 is the same as in the 2006 IBC. Mr. Abel answered that it’s exactly the same. Dave said the question facing the Council is whether to adopt the proposal early or to let it follow the natural course as part of the 2006 code. Rory Calhoun spoke in favor of moving it forward early. Steve Mullet asked if the Council acts on the change early, what will be the effective date. John Neff answered that if regular rulemaking is entered, a public hearing will be held in October, the Council will pass it in November, and the effective date will be July 1, 2006. Alternatively, if it’s passed under emergency rulemaking, the effective date is when the form is filed. Thus it could become effective on July 1, 2005. Steve Mullet spoke in favor of receiving public testimony. Peter DeVries said, given safety implications, he favors emergency

rulemaking and an earlier effective date. However he said the normal process should be followed, allowing all parties a chance to voice their support or opposition. John Neff said the issue qualifies for emergency rulemaking because it is necessary for preservation of public health, safety and general welfare.

Motion #3

Peter DeVries moved that the Council enter emergency rulemaking to adopt proposed statewide amendment #05-006, with an immediate effective date. Simultaneously regular rulemaking will be entered on this issue. Dale Wentworth seconded the motion.

Tom Kinsman spoke against the motion. He said that adopting the proposal under emergency rulemaking expedites things too much. Only one side of the issue has been heard, and opponents may be completely eliminated from the process if it's too quick. Dave Baker also spoke against the motion. He reminded the Council that the Building Code TAG unanimously recommended not adopting this code change proposal. John Cochran agreed with Tom that both sides of the issue haven't been but should be heard. John noted that the issue received lots of debate at the ICC hearings. He asked Mr. Abel if this proposal has been recommended for adoption in other jurisdictions. Mr. Abel answered yes on the national level. Oregon has adopted it. California was a cosponsor to the proposed ICC code change, and they are in the process of adopting it. In addition, a number of other jurisdictions have enacted the proposal out-of-cycle. He suggested that the Council hear additional testimony from the Bellingham boy's grandfather and the high school student who almost bled to death before making a decision on whether or not the wired glass proposal warrants emergency rulemaking.

John Neff said since emergency rules cannot exceed 120 days, permanent rulemaking will be simultaneously entered, moving the issue to the October public hearing. Steve Nuttall said since everyone agrees that wired glass is a dangerous product, it's foolish to continue its use. He encouraged Council members to perform its duty to protect the public's life/safety. Steve favors adopting it through emergency rulemaking and moving it expeditiously forward.

The question was called for. Amendment #05-006 was unanimously adopted.

Dave said the Committee next reviewed International Fire Code (IFC) amendments proposed by the Fire Code TAG in response to the passage of ESHB 1401 by the 2005 Legislature. He said the Committee unanimously recommends passage of the draft amendments to the IFC.

Motion #4

Dave Baker moved entering rulemaking on passage of International Fire Code amendments proposed by the Fire Code TAG. John Cochran seconded the motion.

Tom Kinsman offered a friendly amendment: In item 4, line 2, after “the” strike the remainder of the sentence and insert “occupant load density is determined by Table 1004.1.2 and is less than 10.”

Steve Nuttall said the TAG wrestled with the language, trying to make it as clear as possible. John Neff said the TAG can work on the language and bring it back to the public hearing. Filing doesn’t prevent amending the language.

Tom withdrew his proposed amendment.

Steve Mullet asked why Item #2 is pertinent. Steve Nuttall said it emphasizes beverages of any kind to include nonalcoholic beverages served to teenagers at dance clubs. John Neff said it’s identical to language in the legislation.

The question was called for. Motion #4 was unanimously adopted.

Mechanical, Ventilation and Energy Codes Committee

Peter DeVries, Committee Chair, said the Energy Code TAG recommended denying passage of three code changes proposed by Patrick Hayes. Those amendments deal with existing buildings, concrete masonry walls and slab insulation.

Motion #5

Peter DeVries recommended that the Council not adopt 2005 code changes to the Washington State Energy Code proposed by Patrick Hayes. Dave Baker seconded the motion. The motion was unanimously adopted.

Krista Braaksma explained a proposed amendment for emergency rulemaking that adds an exception for Group R Occupancy in Section 1423, Economizers.

Motion #6:

Peter DeVries moved that the proposed amendment be adopted as an emergency rule. Stephen George seconded the motion.

Krista said this amendment is necessary to correct an inadvertent error. John Neff agreed, saying he's received calls on this issue. John Neff said an emergency rule is appropriate because it defines an exception to the energy code changes going into effect on July 1, 2005. The comment was made that the intent was energy savings, to lower the Btu rating in computer, server and electronic rooms. John Neff said the proposed exception applies solely to residential applications. It reinstates the threshold to 54,000 Btu. Thus commercial buildings are still required to have economizers in computer, server and electronic rooms.

The motion was called for. John Neff clarified that permanent rulemaking on the amendment will simultaneously be filed. The amendment was unanimously adopted.

Peter said the Energy Code TAG has been examining the International Energy Conservation Code (IECC). Its position at this time is that the Council should not adopt the IECC without amendments. The TAG will continue to compare the IECC with the Washington State Energy Code over the next six months. It hopes to bring recommendations to the Committee and the Council by December 2005. John Neff added that while the TAG should know the quantity of amendments required by December, the actual language of those amendments will be developed next year.

LOCAL AMENDMENT REVIEW

John Neff brought up an issue that Dave Baker questioned, whether adoption of the Duvall local amendment was procedurally correct because Rory Calhoun's tabling of that amendment was never removed before the Council adopted it. He said the Duvall local amendment requiring fire sprinklers in multiple single-family residences that meet or exceed 5,000 square feet needs to be removed from the table, and then voted on again.

Motion #7:

Peter DeVries moved to remove the Duvall local amendment from the table. John Cochran seconded the motion. The motion was approved with one dissenting vote.

Motion #8:

Steve Nuttall moved adoption of the Duvall local amendment. Stephen George seconded the motion.

Dave spoke against the local amendment. He said that firewalls totally separate each unit in a townhouse. To also require fire sprinklers is redundant. The IBC has been implemented across the United States and internationally. Dave said that to say

Washington is unique in needing fire sprinklers is ludicrous. Tom Kinsman also spoke against the local amendment. He said these residential buildings have two-hour firewalls separating the units. He's against the increased cost of housing caused by government continually increasing regulation. John Cochran said the requirement for two-hour firewalls fulfills the code's intent. He agreed that additionally requiring fire sprinklers is a redundant and unnecessary added expense. Steve Mullet expressed concern that it's a safety issue in a rural community with rural roads. Dave agreed with the importance of the safety of building occupants. He said that one of the criteria to build a townhouse under the International Residential Code (IRC) is to provide exits in the front and back of the building. (IRC definition: "A single family dwelling unit constructed...with open space on at least two sides.")

Steve Nuttall said the issue is more than the safety of building occupants to him. Rather the issue is the ability of a local authority to make a decision about what local fire protection it provides to its community. One quandary facing local government is how to provide a certain level of service to the community at a reasonable cost. Duvall has chosen fire sprinklers over additional firefighting staff, apparatus and fire stations. He supports their local amendment.

The question was called for on Motion #8. The motion was adopted, six ayes to five nays.

Cashmere Local Amendment

John Neff said the next local amendment to be considered by the Council is from the City of Cashmere. He asked if any city representatives were present. John Neff summarized their amendment, similar to Tri-Cities proposals previously adopted, adding roof covering requirements. He said the rationale for this addition is climatic conditions, lack of rainfall, and life/safety due to the frequency of wildland fires. John Neff remembered a huge fire that burned outside of Cashmere last year in the rural canyons. Peter DeVries, speaking in favor of Cashmere's local amendment, said there have been two devastating fires within the last several years, at Leavenworth and near Cashmere. He said he doesn't recommend any wood shingle or shake roof homes in the Leavenworth area because of fire danger. Nor does he recommend their use anywhere near a forested area. Peter likened the intensity of the Icicle Canyon fire to a blow torch. He said that while a metal roof may have saved some structures, it's questionable whether it would have saved others. Falling embers, driven by strong winds, can extend the fire very quickly to large areas.

John Cochran spoke in favor of the amendment. He recalled compelling aerial photographs of California wildfires, showing standing houses in areas requiring fire retardant-treated roof coverings right next to houses not requiring fire retardant roof coverings that had been leveled to the ground by fires.

Steve Nuttall also spoke for the Cashmere local amendment. He said he witnessed the destruction in 1993 of approximately 30 homes in Wenatchee directly attributable to their shake roofing. Steve said that from an urban wildland interface firefighting standpoint, when a firefighter is forced to choose between saving two structures, one wood shake-roofed and the other not, with limited resources, where only one structure can be saved, the wood shake-roofed house is written off and the other is saved.

Dave expressed concern with the language of the local amendment. He said that while classifying roofing materials as Class A, B and C solves the problem of the combustibility of roof membranes, classifying roof assemblies on all structures in a community causes problems. John Neff said the local amendment classifies the entire assembly. John Cochran said he also has concerns with the language. He said Class A, B and C roof coverings are the membrane. But there can be different membranes on different rated assemblies.

Tom Kinsman spoke against the local amendment. He said the proponent should be present. He objects to changing construction materials without hearing both sides of the issue. Steve Nuttall said that the pro and con arguments occur at the local government level. Tom, speaking from his experience working at the City of Seattle for 25 years, said it's very easy to pass code changes at the local level.

Given uncertainty of the magnitude of the amendment and the lack of a Cashmere representative to answer questions, John Neff wondered if it might be wise to table the local amendment. He would like a Cashmere representative to explain the sentence, "The roof-covering assembly includes the roof deck; underlayment, inner layment, insulation, and covering that is assigned a roof-covering classification." Peter DeVries asked if the amendment prohibits the use of OSB board. John Neff answered that it's unclear. Krista read the definition of "roof assembly." Dave said that the IRC doesn't address classifying roof structures. John Cochran noted that the amendment is to the IBC, not the IRC.

Motion #9:

John Calhoun moved to table the City of Cashmere's local amendment and to request a representative of the City attend the Council meeting at which it's reconsidered. Tom Kinsman seconded the motion. The motion was unanimously adopted.

Clyde Hill Local Amendment

John Neff said the amendment states that no cabinet shall obstruct a doorway or passageway. For example it prevents a child from being isolated in a windowless bathroom by pulling out a cabinet drawer and preventing the access of parents or rescue personnel.

Motion #10:

Dave Baker moved to deny the Clyde Hill local amendment restricting cabinets from obstructing doorways. Tom Kinsman seconded the motion. The amendment was adopted by a vote of 10 to 1. Steve Nuttall recused himself, stating the he's technically a representative of the Clyde Hill Fire Service.

Redmond Local Amendment

John Neff said this amendment requires the sprinklering of connected townhouses with an aggregate area of 5,000 or more square feet. Present in today's audience is both a proponent and an opponent.

Michael Trabue

Michael Trabue, the Assistant Fire Marshall with the City of Redmond, spoke in support of the local amendment. He said that Redmond is a unique community on the eastside of Lake Washington in the foothills outside of Seattle. Its uniqueness affects its ability to provide fire suppression services: the infrastructure to supply and maintain firefighting water supplies, the infrastructure to provide and maintain public roads for firefighting apparatus response times, financial constraints to provide firefighting city services to increasingly densely populated developments.

Currently Redmond's water utility limits the ability for fire suppression water to be supplied to residentially zoned areas to 1,500 gallons per minute at 20 psi. This is the minimal pressure necessary to provide pumping from the city's underground mains. Historically the Redmond Fire Department has found and designed its response around the standard that "typical" single-family residential structures require 1,500 gpm.

Fire Chief Tim Fuller and Fire Marshall Bob Lovett have reviewed the IRC definition of townhomes and concluded that they require 3,600 gpm and sprinklering. Redmond falls behind the current NFPA recommendation for a five-minute fire response time by two minutes on average within the city. The fire response time for some residential areas of Redmond that are densely populated is eight and one-half minutes. Mr. Trabue said that financial constraints are a policy issue decided by the Redmond City Council.

Dave asked why the City of Redmond limits gpm to 1,500. Mr. Trabue responded that it's a design constraint imposed by the Redmond Department of Public Works. It represents a policy decision of the Redmond City Engineer, as the maximum the city designed and guarantees the system to supply. Peter DeVries asked if the diameter of pipes in the existing water lines limits the gallons per minute to 1,500. Mr. Trabue said it's probably a combination of the size of the pipes and how the land is graded. He said

the utility engineer makes that determination. The Public Works Director has indicated that 1,500 gpm in residential areas is the maximum he can guarantee.

Michael Trabue, speaking from his experience supervising fire investigation efforts in Redmond residences over the past two years, said that required fire suppression resources in sprinklered structures are minimal compared to nonsprinklered structures. Structure damage is minimal, clean up is quick, and residents return within a short period of time.

Brian Minnich

Brian Minnich, with the Building Industry Association of Washington (BIAW), thanked the Council for giving local amendments serious debate. He said that a state building code prevents the chaos caused by each local jurisdiction enacting its own individual building code. The resulting uniformity is extremely important to the building and design communities that work across many jurisdictions.

Brian said BIAW has concerns about the City of Redmond's local amendment. He called attention to a letter from the Master Builders of King and Snohomish Counties. They opposed the amendment when it was considered last year at the local level. Brian asked the Council to carefully review the correlation of uniqueness criteria and Redmond's justification. He said both King County and the City of Bellevue considered and rejected similar fire sprinkler amendments.

Brian noted that builders in this type of development are very sensitive to increasing housing costs. He said it's increasingly more difficult to construct affordable housing. Brian questioned whether the benefits of adding fire sprinklers are worth the increased housing cost.

Brian's final point is that builders are very concerned about liability insurance. He said that the liability insurance market over the last five years in Washington, as well as in Oregon and California, has dictated construction practices. Contractor liability for system failures, as well as the cost and availability of insurance, are issues faced by builders.

Steve Mullet said that for local amendments he's compelled to respect and agree with local jurisdictions' justification. However he views statewide amendments differently.

Motion 11:

Steve Nuttall moved adoption of the City of Redmond's local amendment requiring sprinklers in townhouses. Dale Wentworth seconded the motion.

Tom Kinsman recommended that a statewide amendment on this issue is more appropriate than a local amendment. He said if the local amendment has validity as a life safety issue, it should be adopted on a statewide basis.

The question was called for. Motion #10 failed, five aye to six nay.

Steve Nuttall, noting that the Council has previously approved similar local amendments for jurisdictions surrounding the City of Redmond, said that rationale for denial of Redmond's local amendment needs to be formulated.

Neva Cockrum pointed out that local amendments can't be less stringent than the minimal state code. She said that if local jurisdictions wish to enact more stringent local ordinances, the elected officials representing those jurisdictions must explain the need for added stringency to their constituents. Peter DeVries said the current local amendment approval process appears somewhat hit and miss. He suggested that the Council discuss the issue of sprinkler systems and townhouses, from a historical perspective, current status, rationale, specifics related to each jurisdiction.

John Neff asked questions of the fire marshals association: how sprinklers work, fireflow calculation, exposure issues. He said that the Council needs understanding and knowledge of these terms. John Neff said he previously opposed local amendments requiring sprinklers in townhouses, given the absence of compelling evidence. However John felt that Redmond made a good case for them. Peter agreed that it would benefit the Council to have more open discussion of this issue without the pressure of adopting or denying local amendments. He said there are certainly differences between fire districts, their size, personnel, resources, etc. He recommended inviting experts to educate Council members.

Steve Barber, State Fire Marshal's Office, said that the use of two-hour firewalls was very heavily discussed during the ICC uniform codes process. Their use in determining the need for sprinklers was eliminated because of past problems.

Steve Nuttall expressed concern about the Council's vote against Redmond's local amendment. He said that the City of Redmond adopted the local amendment because it wanted to control the cost of fire protection services while providing a certain level of service to its communities. The local amendment accomplished both goals for them. The Council's vote told Redmond that it has to provide fire protection services like every other community in the state and pay for those services. Steve questioned whether the Council has authority to dictate the acceptable level of fire risk within a given city. Less questionable is whether the Council is educated enough about the issue to do so.

Steve Nuttall said that the City of Bellevue currently sprinklers 75 percent of all structures built. In addition the national trend is currently leaning toward sprinklering all structures. Consequently he said Redmond's request is neither unusual nor uncommon.

Tom Kinsman said Steve Nuttall's comments speak in support of a potential state amendment on sprinklering. Several other members disagreed. Neva reminded the Council that there is an exception to every rule. She said that is the issue before the Council with local amendments. The International set of codes establishes the minimum standards. If local jurisdictions wish to adopt higher standards, Neva believes they should be able to do so.

Motion #12:

Dave Baker moved that the Council adopt a moratorium on considering local amendments dealing with sprinkler systems for a six-month period, to allow the Council to educate itself about the issue.

John Neff said that the Council is legally required to act on local amendments within a certain timeframe. He said the statute clearly states the Council's authority and responsibility to approve or deny all county or city amendments that apply to single- or multifamily residential buildings. While taking such actions may not always be pleasant, the Council is statutorily required to take action.

Dave Baker withdrew Motion #12.

John Cochran asked if the Council can move for reconsideration of previously adopted local amendments dealing with sprinklers after it holds an educational work session on the sprinkler issue. John Neff agreed that is possible, as well as unlimited resubmittal of local amendments by local jurisdictions.

John Neff suggested holding a work session possibly in July. It was decided that July is too soon. Thus a work session will be held in conjunction with the September 9 Council meeting.

STAFF REPORT

Tim Nogler said that the Existing Building Code SubTAG will meet next Tuesday at SeaTac to continue its comparison of the International Existing Building Code, the IBC, Chapter 34, and the Washington State Historic Building Code. After that meeting, the SubTAG will recess until the 2006 code editions are available.

Work on updating the Council's web page is progressing. Council staff has been working with CTED's Information Technology staff and Council volunteers on the update. Tim said he's continuing work on ADA certification to DOJ. He's also been working on a position description to fill the position previously held by Al Rhoades.

Tim announced that Senator Joyce Mulliken and Representative Timm Ormsby have been appointed by their respective houses of the Legislature to serve as ex officio Council members.

ADJOURNMENT

Lacking further business, John Neff adjourned the Council meeting at 1:45 p.m.